

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 13-20, 23 and 50 are pending in this application. Claims 11, 12, 21, 22 and 24-49 are withdrawn. Claims 1, 13, 23 and 50 are amended by the present response without introducing new matter. Support for amendments to the claims can be found, at least, in Figures 19 and 40.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-7, 10, 13, 14-18, 23 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Eldridge et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,421,716, herein "Eldridge"); and Claims 8, 9, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Eldridge.

Addressing now the rejection of Claims 1-7, 10, 13, 14-18, 23 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Eldridge that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 recites, in part,

a service providing part configured to provide a service which a user utilizes,

wherein said service providing part further includes a service information providing part configured to provide information concerning the service in response to a request from a user terminal, the information including at least an address of the service and a type of the service and enabling the user to utilize the service when selected, and

wherein the service is configured to operate a hardware resource which performs image formation.

Claims 13, 23 and 50 recite similar features.

Eldridge describes a system for performing document services using a mobile computing device. Specifically, Eldridge describes that a user is able to use a mobile phone to select a document stored on a remote server to be acted upon by one of a number of remote services.

However, Eldridge does not describe or suggest a service information providing part configured to provide information concerning the service in response to a request from a user terminal, the information including at least an address of the service and a type of the service and enabling the user to utilize the service when selected.

As is seen in Figure 4A, items 404, 416, 420, 429 and 442, and described in col. 10, lines 4-25, the system of Eldridge describes providing a list of available services to a mobile device. Nowhere does Eldridge describe or suggest that information including an address of the service and a type of the service are sent to the mobile device.

In other words, while Eldridge merely describes that a list of available services available for acting on a remote document is sent to a mobile device, Claim 1 describes that information that enables the user to utilize the service when selected includes the address of the service and the type of the service.

As is discussed on page 3, lines 4-6 of the current disclosure, systems such as the one disclosed in Eldridge have a problem that they only provide a list of available services. The information necessary for the client terminal to directly access the various services is not included along with the list of available services.

In contrast, the claimed invention describes that the information that enables the user to utilize the service when selected is initially provided to the user. Thus, when the user desires to select an available service, the user is able to quickly and efficiently access the service without having to receive additional information.

In Eldridge the mobile user device does not actually contain a copy of the document to be acted upon by the service. Instead the system of Eldridge describes that tokens representing the documents are sent to a server along with a selection of a service from a list of available services that is provided. The user device of Eldridge does not need to access information such as the location or the type of service (as this information is utilized by the

- Application No. 10/781,739
Reply to Office Action of July 16, 2007

server and not the mobile device) and thus this information is not sent to the user mobile device along with the list of available services.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 and similarly Claims 13, 23 and 50, and claims depending therefrom, patentably distinguish over Eldridge.

In addition, with respect to rejection of Claims 8, 9, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Eldridge, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Specifically, the outstanding Action states on page 3 that

Eldridge does not teach that the information concerning the service stored in said service information storing part is written in at least two languages, and the request includes language indication information indicating a language of the information of the service, the information to be included in a response corresponding to the request. However, the Examiner notes that this limitation is not functionally involved in the elements of the recited system. Therefore this limitation is deemed to be nonfunctional descriptive material. The elements of the apparatus would be the same regardless of what language the service was written in. The difference between the claimed invention and the prior art is merely subjective. Thus this nonfunctional descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the language indication information recited in Claims 8, 9, 19 and 20 is not merely nonfunctional descriptive material. Clearly the language indication information is an important feature in the claimed invention. As is illustrated in Figure 19, the data that is displayed on a user terminal is different depending on what type of language the user terminal uses. Thus, the apparatus clearly has a specific function of using language indication information to display options specific to the user in question. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that rejection of Claims 8, 9, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is improper as the features recited therein are not simply nonfunctional descriptive material.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)



James J. Kimbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

I:\ATTY\JL\249090\US\249090\US_AM(8.29.2007).doc